

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, and 7-19, as amended, appear in this application for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claims 1, 9, and 19 were amended to correct informalities, while claims 18 and 19 were amended to clarify that the detachment is conducted under conditions sufficient to obtain a detached layer that is substantially homogenous and has a low surface roughness and improved homogeneity compared to the surface roughness and homogeneity obtained from a conventional detachment annealing on a wafer having a weakened zone but not a super-weakened region. As there is no issue of new matter being introduced, these claim amendments should be entered at this time.

Claims 1, 9, 18 and 19 were objected to due to certain informalities. As noted above, those claims have been amended to obviate these errors and the objection is moot.

Claims 18 and 19 were also rejected as being indefinite due to the relative language of "low surface roughness" and "improved homogeneity". Applicants traverse the rejection.

Rather than being undefined relative terms, this language in claims 18 and 19 has been carefully selected to recite that the present process achieves such values "compared to the surface roughness and homogeneity obtained from a conventional detachment annealing on a wafer having a weakened zone but not a super-weakened region". The specification clearly teaches the advantages in these properties that are obtained when a super-weakened region is used compared to the prior art use of a conventionally weakened region. Accordingly, these properties are measured against those of the prior art, so that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The drawings were objected to as the process steps of claim 1 are not illustrated. In response, although applicants repeat and adopt herein the comments made in their last response, to advance the prosecution of this application, there is submitted herewith a new Figure 4 along with an appropriate amendment to the specification to refer to that figure. No new matter has been entered since the claims as originally filed support the flow chart that is now depicted in Figure 4. Accordingly, the specification changes and the new drawing sheet should be entered to overcome the present rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, 12, and 14-19 were rejected over the combination of US patents 6,597,039 to Ohmi et al. and 6,911,376 to Yoo, while claim 13 was rejected over the prior

combination in further view of US patent application 2003/0234075 to Aspar et al. for the reasons set forth on pages 5 to 8 of the office action. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Yoo patent is not prior art to the present application. Yoo was filed October 1, 2003, which is approximately two months later than the filing date of applicants' French priority application, FR 03-09597, which was filed August 4, 2003. Although not acknowledged in the current office action, applicants in fact have submitted a certified copy of the priority document. To perfect the priority claim and to demonstrate that the priority application supports the present claims, applicants submit herewith a true and complete English translation of the French priority document. Accordingly, the later filed Yoo patent is not prior art to the present application and all rejections based upon Yoo should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, as all rejections have been overcome, it is believed that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, early notice of which would be appreciated. In the event that the Examiner does not agree that all claims are now allowable, a personal or telephonic interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues in an effort to expedite the eventual allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

5-23-06

Date



Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
Customer No. 28765
212-294-3311